

**STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT**

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**RESTRUCTURING THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES FOR THE
TWENTY FIRST CENTURY**

BY

**COLONEL ANA R. SMYTHE
United States Marine Corps**

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.**

USAWC CLASS OF 2000



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

20000526 095

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

Restructuring the Foreign Affairs Agencies for the Twenty First Century

by

Colonel Ana R. Smythe
USMC

David C. Bennett
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Ana R. Smythe

TITLE: Restructuring the Foreign Affairs Agencies for the Twenty First Century

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 15 April 2000 PAGES: 21 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

This paper underscores the critical need for cultural change and professional development in the Foreign Affairs Agencies of the United States in order to meet the challenge of a dynamically changed global environment following the end of The Cold War and the advent of the 21st Century. Antiquated human resources and administrative practices, inadequate resources poorly allocated, and lack of state of the art information technology and crumbling facilities call for reorganization and reform essential to professional representation of the United States at home and abroad. Congressional legislation that supports strong leadership from within Foreign Affairs Agencies will result in a relevant model of diplomacy practiced by well motivated, well-trained people who are proactive, participatory and good stewards in promoting and protecting U.S. national interests.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
RESTRUCTURING THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES FOR THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY	1
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND.....	2
PROBLEM SOLVING.....	3
SPECIFIC ISSUES AND ACTIONS	5
RECRUITING AND RETAINING PERSONNEL	6
TRAINING.....	8
OBTAINING RESOURCING	8
DISCUSSION.....	9
CONCLUSIONS	11
ENDNOTES	13
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	15

RESTRUCTURING THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES FOR THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY

Nineteen ninety-nine marked the 75th anniversary of the U.S. Foreign Service. "Through much of the 20th century, the men and women of the Foreign Service have provided Presidents and ordinary citizens with expert, loyal and courageous front-line representation around the world in war and peace and all manner of crisis and disaster."¹

INTRODUCTION

"The last 40 years have seen ever-increasing U.S. power and responsibility in world affairs, the intensifying and eventual ending of the cold War and the emergence of global issues that cut across geographical and regional boundaries."²

Following the end of the Cold War, the armed forces of the United States experienced significant reductions in personnel and equipment, increasing the importance of non-military Executive Branch departments and agencies in assuring the national security of the United States. In addition to the Congress, with its traditional roles in authorizing and funding government operations, ratifying treaties, and providing advice and consent to the appointments of senior government officials, most cabinet Departments and over a dozen independent agencies are involved in foreign affairs. How effectively these Departments and agencies, and the Congress, work together is critical to the success of U.S. foreign and national security policies. However, there appears to be a general consensus that the foreign affairs agencies of the United States lack the capability to deal with the emerging challenges even on an adequate basis. The culture within the agencies tends to accept a no longer relevant status quo. How the personnel from the major foreign affairs agencies are recruited, trained, and assigned is essential to the contribution of each to the advancement of U.S. national interests. The purpose of this paper is to identify certain weaknesses in the existing structures and policies within these agencies, and propose solutions to redress these weaknesses and in essence bring about the cultural change will reenergize the agencies in preparing for and responding to the global changes of the 21st Century.

The federal budget of the United States includes a category called the "Function 150, International Affairs." It encompasses all of the Foreign Affairs Agencies. Overseen by four congressional subcommittees, this Function provides funding for export promotion, Food for Peace, operation of the Foreign Affairs agencies, foreign aid, Foreign Military Sales (FMS), Security Assistance (SA), and contributions to International Financial Institutions (IFIs). The major federal Departments and Agencies employing Function 150 funds are the Agency for International Development, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, and the Export-Import Bank of the United States. Within several of these organizations work a number of dedicated men and women called Foreign Service Officers. All are employed under the authority of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, PL 96-465, 22 USC 3927. The majority of these officers work for the Department of State (DOS), the Agency for International Development (USAID), the Foreign Commercial Service (FCS) of the Department of Commerce, and the Foreign

Agriculture Service (FAS) of the Department of Agriculture. The focus of my analysis and recommendations shall address these organizations and their Commissioned Foreign Service Officer personnel.

The new challenges facing the diplomatic world of today and tomorrow, including terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the environment, migration and ethnic conflicts throughout the world require not only an increased response but the development of new strategies and approaches to solve these problems. In order to respond to these new crises our nation will need more than ever a competent, dedicated professional diplomatic corps, operating in a career development system that provides for recruiting and retention, and progressive and career enhancing training in fully resourced agencies.

BACKGROUND

The Department of State Strategic Plan emphasizes that "Diplomatic Readiness requires a high-performance organization: the right people, with the right skills and support, in the right places, to defend national security and promote national interests."³ However, these parameters are not being met today, nor have they been met for the past several decades.

The Department of State (DOS) has attempted to grow in order to respond to this increased responsibility with adequate resources. Together with the Congress, DOS has responded to the modern problems of crisis management, terrorism, science and technology development, the environment, migration, human rights, narcotics and refugee affairs by creating new organizations at the bureau level. This rapid growth "threatened timely policy-making with recurrent bureaucratic bottlenecks."⁴

However the Foreign Affairs Agencies have a long history both documented and anecdotal of poor personnel management. For the past five decades the same issues and concerns of poor career management and training have been reiterated time and again to no avail. Even though countless reports, studies and committees have determined that the same concerns still exist, despite the numerous recommendations proposed within these reports, the problems persist. However, at this juncture the Administration must come to resolution - with declining resources and increasing issues around the world, the government no longer can support Foreign Affairs Agencies that fail to make a case for their requirements. There must be a better way but internal attempts have failed. This leads to my view that outside impetus must be used to lead to change. That influence must come from Congress.

The Senior Foreign Service is the area that requires the most critical reassessment and implementation of an innovative and dynamic restructuring. Currently the Senior Foreign Service is not structured to meet the expanding needs. Upward career mobility does not require adequate stepping stones to ensure senior leadership has the diverse background gained through joint assignments, formal training and education at various levels. There is no planned career development program to prepare for higher responsibilities.

Michael McLaughlin, Director of the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services (ICASS) Service Center in the Department of State stated. "Based on my 26 years experience with the Department's personnel system, the only constant is change. Reactive and driven by crisis, the short term, quick fixes to quell the latest outcry triumph over long term planning and consistency. The result is a body of personnel policies and regulations that have grown like "topsy" with no discernable overall purpose."⁵

The report, State 2000, New Model for Managing Foreign Affairs (a Report of the U.S. Department of State Management Task Force), states that "the Department must address the central failing of our personnel management; the lack of a strategy that explicitly links the Department's mission with the personnel charged with accomplishing it. Too often, State suffers from a mismatch between what we want to do and the skills of those we expect to do it."⁶

AFSA, in a broadcast dated October 20, 1999, stated that "no organization that views its mission seriously should tolerate the numerous extended staffing gaps that we in the Foreign Service routinely experience. Years of lean budgets and expanding commitments have produced a situation in which we have about 500 fewer people than positions. AFSA has long advocated that the Department develop a long-term workforce plan (as the Pentagon does) in order to build a stronger case for expanded Diplomatic Readiness."⁷

The concerns and frustrations depicted by these individuals and organizations support the need for change. Some change has come, but it has not addressed many of the concerns voiced here. Specifically, recruiting, retention, training, and resourcing need resolution.

PROBLEM SOLVING

"Attempts to reform and reorganize the conduct of diplomacy and the Foreign Service during the past 15 years have often been hampered by budget and personnel cuts. Despite expanding responsibilities, State has remained one of the lowest-funded major government agencies with an ever-increasing daily impact on the lives of Americans - not only those who travel or conduct business abroad but also those concerned about the world role of the United States."⁸

An attempt to find a solution to these ever-burgeoning problems led to the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1980. "It provided far more rigorous standards for recruitment and performance, improved the benefits of service and confronted problems of career advancement that were sapping morale within the service."⁹ Despite these improvements, problems have not only persisted but continued to escalate over the past several decades and were exacerbated as a result of "the end of the Cold War, rapid changes in technology, and the pressures of domestic politics ... all changing the dynamic of our approach to foreign affairs."¹⁰

As we look for examples of positive action that have addressed issues within the Foreign Affairs Agencies, one initiative that has been successful is ICASS. . The management of embassies overseas has been an issue of concern because of the a duplication of service and staff, improper accountability of

major expenses, and gross inequity in the distribution of the costs associated with the operation of a diplomatic establishment overseas. An initiative to address this area was adopted and "On October 1, 1997 the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services (ICASS) System was implemented 'live' at 162 posts abroad, the culmination of over two years of planning and testing."¹¹ "The ICASS system is a customer-driven, voluntary interagency system for managing and funding shared administrative support services abroad."¹² "ICASS is a paradigm shift in the way the Department of State and other Foreign Affairs Agencies manage the administrative platform that supports their overseas programs and activities. The primary objective is quality services at the lowest cost."¹³ The implementation of this system is ongoing and the results although still being scrutinized are viewed as an improvement over the practices of the past. ICASS is addressing one area of personnel management by consolidating administrative services and therefore reducing personnel requirements. However, this initiative has little or no direct affect on the longstanding staffing issues occurring at the embassies. It is however one example where a resolution was sought and implemented to answer identified problems within the Foreign Affairs Agencies.

Another reorganization and reform initiative has taken effect attempting to address the need for change within the structure of the Foreign Affairs Agencies. With the implementation of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act, a major reorganization has taken place at the Department of State. "The United States Information Agency (USIA) and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) have been abolished and integrated into State, the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) will become an independent executive branch entity, and the International Development Cooperation Agency will be eliminated. The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) will be under the direct authority and foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State, and USAID's press office and certain administrative functions will move to State. About seven thousand personnel are involved."¹⁴ This reorganization is an attempt to address the fact that "State's operating budgets have declined by 17% in real terms, forcing State into a substantial and ongoing reorientation of priorities. During this time, the number of U.S. embassies has increased by 16, and State's consular workload – which is required to protect America's borders and Americans overseas – has increased by 22%. Meanwhile, turbulence around the world from the Balkans to the Persian Gulf to Central Africa and East Asia has generated new threats to American interests and new demands on America's international affairs resources."¹⁵ The initiatives contained in this act reflect the "ongoing, continuous effort within the Department to eliminate duplication, ensure accountability, set clear strategic goals and achieve results."¹⁶ The introduction of this act underscores the awareness that change is necessary. It also highlights that the mission for these agencies is expanding, yet resources are declining. The implementation of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act is one avenue to address change, others are necessary.

Additional restructuring and reorganization is necessary to effect the cultural change necessary to make the Foreign Affairs agencies effective and efficient in accomplishing their mission. This change should be initiated with the aid of Congress. The military benefited from reorganization, in the passage of

the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986. This Act provides a model and potential framework for change for the Foreign Affairs Agencies.

Informally called the Goldwater-Nichols Act or GNA, this was a comprehensive defense reorganization package "designed to accelerate the unification of the armed forces by fundamentally altering the manner in which they were raised, trained, commanded, and employed; the GNA impacted virtually all major elements of DOD."¹⁷

The military was unable to redirect itself. The change had to come from outside the DOD, and Article I of the US Constitution identifies Congress as the body responsible for change and redirection. Congress passed the GNA of 1986. This law forced a restructuring and refocusing of the military's efforts in order to meet the changing world. The military services proceeded through a reevaluation of priorities, practice, and policies.

Despite the fact that the GNA is still being implemented (as an ongoing process) its achievements cannot be ignored. Ultimately it has generated change, balance and cooperation among the services to meet the demands levied by Congress and the President.

The GNA required reform in numerous areas. One of them was a change in the military culture, a change that would alter the pattern in which officers would serve and channel their career. It related to an understanding that the joint environment, which meant all of the services working and operating together, had to be the focus of the future. Training and assignment to the joint environment was a necessity that had to be incorporated into each and every career. As a requirement for promotion jointness was no longer a service directed option. It eliminated to a real degree service parochialism and broadened the scope of thinking and planning for the military professional.

Finally, as regards the GNA, as defense resources decline, the maximum return on investment must be obtained to the extent that planning systems and bureaucratic processes allow for participation and consensus building, while also permitting the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff a strong hand as the principal military adviser, the promise of the GNA to achieve real reform will have been fulfilled.¹⁸

The GNA has been successful and it is that success that leads me to believe that similar legislation can equally affect the Foreign Affairs Agencies and induce change in the areas of manning, training, and resourcing.

SPECIFIC ISSUES AND ACTIONS

Similar issues as those covered by Goldwater-Nichols must be addressed by the Foreign Affairs Agencies, if they are to transition to the 21st Century successfully. The changes must result in a new culture that will recruit and retain the right people, provide the right training, and energize their institution in order to obtain the necessary resources to produce affective and efficient performance in the national policy arena. As I have highlighted throughout the paper, the status quo has failed and previous attempts to change the culture have failed. I propose that legislation be developed that will require the Department of State (DOS) and the other Foreign Affairs Agencies to set realistic goals and achieve them. If the DOS

Strategic Plan presented in 1999 and its attendant budget request is to be validated as realistic and essential the organization must change.

The plan for restructuring the organization must be comprehensive and supportable. A faster-paced, more interconnected world will require a cadre of dedicated professional diplomats who understand how to get things done in more complex environments. America's foreign policy will require more professional flexibility and agility, yet the rigid existing personnel system still pigeonholes and bureaucratizes. The system needs to find and nurture exceptionally talented individuals to meet the increasingly diverse demands of the coming century.¹⁹ This nurturing means viable career plans with clear milestones.

RECRUITING AND RETAINING PERSONNEL

The current personnel system must develop a more flexible structure that seeks to bring out the best in the people it recruits and to develop the expertise it will need in the future,²⁰ by mandating into law a forced but viable career progression. This progression must ensure that Senior Foreign Service Officers are not only motivated to meet the challenges of the 21st century but are trained, experienced and capable of affecting the critical decision process that faces the diplomatic community. This will require a complete overhaul of the existing personnel policies. The critical element of this initiative, as with the GNA, is the that the Foreign Affairs Agencies must be forced to adhere to reforms:

Attracting the best and brightest to the Foreign Service is not a recent challenge. During the upheaval of the 1960s and '70s, with its political assassinations, civil rights, Vietnam and Watergate, the confidence in public service began to wane. At that time, many of the best minds in America went into journalism and academia. By the '80s and '90s, Wall Street and Silicon Valley were the place to be. Today, finance and high-tech command the greatest compensation. The Foreign Affairs Agencies cannot compete with their salaries and high potential payoffs.²¹

Language and regional expertise, strong analytical and diplomatic skills, and a deep knowledge of history, international relations, negotiation and cross cultural communications will continue to be the starting point for America's professional diplomatic service. But the emerging foreign policy agenda will also require people with specialized capabilities in a wide range of areas.

The goal must be to give wider scope to the able men and women of the Foreign Affairs Agencies to exercise their abilities and to take initiative. An effort must be made not simply to fill slots in a hierarchy, but to make sure that those positions evolve, change, and are created or eliminated when necessary, to fit the needs of an information global environment subject to rapid change and increasing complexity.

The following recommendations are made:

- (1) The Foreign Affairs Agencies must conduct a workforce planning review to identify the skills that will be needed to address the areas that will be important in the next century, including finance, economic development, environmental sciences, military affairs,

- science and technology, rule of law, and other issues. When fully assessed this analysis should be presented to Congress as a driver for legislative action.
- (2) A revived foreign service reserve system will provide a cadre of personnel with specialized skills who can be called upon for short or long-term assignments overseas, as needed. Reserve personnel would be recruited from government agencies other than State, as well as outside entities such as academia, industry, and the professions. Periodic training should be provided.²²
- (3) Improve the quality of life for overseas employees: The Overseas Presence Advisory Panel recommends providing greater employment opportunities for spouses, revising anti-nepotism rules, taking a family oriented approach to management of overseas assignments, and reducing the burdensome aspects of the procedures for the travel and transportation.
- (4) Develop a comprehensive human resources strategy that, among other things, takes into account the 10 to 15 percent of the workforce who are in training or travel status at any given time.²³ The critical personnel gaps that are experienced by all staffs during the rotation cycle cause severe reduction in efficiency.
- (5) Brief senior executive courses taught by outside consultants should be a requirement for all senior promotions.²⁴ The Foreign Service appears to shy away from building leadership skills. It lacks an adequate system for identifying first-class leadership potential. Leadership is too often confused with being able to write brilliantly and render excellent analysis. Leadership means more than taking care of those above you.
- (6) The promotion system should be revamped to require the Foreign Affairs Agencies to develop functional expertise to deal with cross cutting issues that transcend a traditional political or economic designation. The current "up and out" system has the unintended impact of effectively advancing some very qualified personnel out of the Foreign Affairs Agencies. This recommendation allows other avenues of retention of proven professionals.
- (7) Develop promotion policies that encourage service in jobs classified in functional specialties. Traditionally the Foreign Service promotion precepts have been heavily weighted to favor skills used in "traditional diplomacy", leaving officers who serve in functional assignments (political, military, environment, or labor affairs for example) at a competitive disadvantage. Condition promotion into the senior ranks of the foreign affairs agencies on successful completion of rigorous training programs in management skills and negotiation techniques.²⁵
- (8) Revise the assignment policy. A critical element of a Foreign Affairs Agency officer's career progression must include an understanding of how other Foreign Affairs Agencies function and interact with his own. A mandatory assignment during mid-level career, to

another agency, outside their own, would do much to overcome the insularity and parochialism that currently exists. Cross-cultural understanding remains essential.

TRAINING

Training must be one avenue to ensure upward progression and success, as well as an opportunity to gain the skill level necessary to excel whether it is technical, diplomatic, language, or regional expertise.

- (1) Expand training, including making mandatory leadership and management training. The Overseas Presence Advisory Panel estimated that up to half of Department personnel go to their overseas assignments without appropriate training.
- (2) Develop more extensive cooperation with private academic institutions, including the establishment of academic credit for FSI training.²⁶
- (3) Require more focused, less generic and higher quality training be developed and accomplished for all levels of advancement. Attendance at designated training would be a prerequisite for promotion. Fulfillment of this training will in fact enhance the opportunity for advancement, rather than stymie it. . Rather than an option it must be a mandate for promotion.
- (4) Attendance at career training must not affect either the individual's job opportunities or the organization's ability to achieve the mission, i.e. as previously stated, an adequate level of personnel must provide for the resulting vacancies/gaps. The stigma attached to career training must be eradicated from the culture.
- (5) Institute mandatory training of foreign service personnel in public diplomacy. The responsibility of being a diplomat belongs to every Foreign Affairs Agency officer and it is critical that this role be embraced through training and practice. Diplomacy has to move beyond parochial interests and engage more than ever the growing number of non-governmental organizations and single-issue advocacy groups. In a recent symposium, sponsored by the Public Diplomacy Foundation and the American Foreign Service Association, Barry Fulton of USIA, said that the Department of State "must change and jettison its fetish for secrecy, giving greater trust to its employees to do their jobs. It must modernize its technology as a multiplier for diplomacy, but it must also embrace 'diplomacy networking.'"²⁷

OBTAINING RESOURCING

The resources to accomplish the task are clearly funding, people, information technology, adequate facilities at home and abroad and the training to bring it together. It is crucial that the current staffing and overseas presence be reevaluated. A structure must be created that is the right size and provides the appropriate overseas presence. In recent years, the Foreign Service, already small, has

taken significant personnel cuts. These cuts have been an arbitrary response to indiscriminate resource reductions, rather than a carefully developed course of action.

The following recommendations are made:

- (1) Conduct a top down review of personnel requirements, validating each position based on need rather than template. Each embassy or organization's requirements will vary significantly, based on size, location and workload. Staffing must reflect mission.
- (2) Information technology must be a priority, brought up to current standards. In order to be viewed as relevant and participatory , the Foreign Affairs Agencies must ensure they are employing systems that are compatible and interoperable across the full spectrum of the Foreign Affairs Agencies. The application of common technology and the right sizing of web sites would prove economical and smart.
- (3) Establish a centralized facilities review initiative that would articulate cost across the board. Currently facilities are in grim shape in most locations. A comprehensive study accomplished by a subcommittee could be extremely effective in prioritizing requirements.
- (4) Develop a cost analysis program, which outlines funding needed to accomplish a specific mission.

One critical element of this equation that is often ignored or downplayed is the importance of relations between the Foreign Affairs Agencies and Congress. For years there has existed a lack of understanding and ability to effect good communication between Congress and the Foreign Affairs Agencies. This reality serves to undermine the effectiveness and ability of these agencies to successfully pursue national interests. The importance of this relationship is twofold. First, Congress supports the Foreign Affairs Agencies in both their funding and staffing via Function 150 and second, there needs to be a clear understanding by members of Congress of the importance of these agencies in promoting the administration's goals, objectives and policies in national security and foreign policy. In the absence of this understanding many of the functions of the Foreign Affairs Agencies may appear superfluous.

The fact is the Foreign Affairs Agencies have done nothing to change that view. The secretive, removed approach these agencies foster undermines their ability to sell their own credibility. Congressional support can only be gained through a greater engagement between Foreign Service officials and congressional staffers, Representatives and Senators in discussion about key foreign affairs issues.

An emphasis must be placed on the need to build constituent relations for the Foreign Affairs Agencies. Specifically, the Department of State must do a better job with its public affairs outreach in making ambassadors and other diplomatic personnel available to speak to constituents throughout the country. The reality is that Congress is a reflection of American society and only one percent of American society has had any dealings with the international community; therefore it is critical for State Department Officers to engage Representatives and Senators in dialogue and keep them informed on critical issues.

Another way to strengthen relations between Congress and State is to emulate DOD's model. Currently, space is made available for personnel of the armed services on Capitol Hill, ensuring a constant reciprocal flow of information between Congress and the military. The Foreign Affairs Agencies need to establish congressional liaison offices on Capitol Hill that would contribute to a closer working relationship between congressional members and Senior Foreign Service Officers. This interaction would promote understanding and communication, forging levels of cooperation.

The Foreign Service Agencies need to undergo significant change. This realization is shared by personnel within the Agencies, those who have retired from the Agencies, and those external to the Agencies. Multiple reports, articles, and documentaries have validated this requirement. The justification has been voiced for decades, but initiating the required action has proven insurmountable. The issue has never been identifying the problem, it has been correctly addressing it and putting effective solutions in place. The proposed solutions addressed above will require legislation to be effective, only through mandating into law the required action will the cultural change take place. The legislation will affect every Foreign Service Officer's career progression. In time, establishing mandatory training requirements, incorporating an assignment with another agency into a career pattern, requiring training in public diplomacy, revalidating the personnel structure will serve as the corner stone for the cultural change that will result. An important piece of the puzzle that cannot be mandated through legislation is the relationship with Congress, but as stated it is equally critical.

The catalytic agent for change however to accomplish the above is internal leadership which will require that promotion boards have sets of precepts that allow a broader range of activities, assignments, training and education. Rewarding and recognizing this career pattern is the proof that a new model has emerged based on merit and achievement versus politics and favoritism. This presupposes that quality resources, both human and financial, will be dedicated to the task of managing and training/educating personnel. Without this cadre of "teachers/mentors" devoted to the mission, change will be desultory at best and demoralizing at worst. The investment of people and money in this structure of recruiting, educating and assigning trained personnel must be fully understood and supported by Congressional legislation. Without both internal and external actions converging to provide a new cultural synergy, cultural change will fail to the detriment of national and security policy formulation and implementation.

The technical revolution between the 20th and 21st centuries is telecommunications. It has reduced time and space factors in some cases to mere minutes in decision making. In such a fast paced world where the friction between globalization and nationalism forms the backdrop it can no longer be business as usual for the Foreign Affairs Agencies. Interagency activity has to be proactive, well planned and anticipatory. The National Security environment with the potential for rogue actors, terrorism, and failed states is in some ways more dangerous than the Cold War. The initial point of contact and assessment globally to help shape issues remains with the Foreign Affairs Agencies. The reaction model of the 20th century however will not work. Without a truly professional, well trained motivated Foreign Service the room for miscalculation becomes greater. The United States cannot afford to be second rate

in this context. Leadership from within the Foreign Affairs Agencies must respond to the 21st Century challenges with a new model. Congress must be convinced that this is a forward looking approach to diplomacy and cooperate by producing positive legislation for change.

CONCLUSIONS

The 21st Century offers an opportunity for the Foreign Affairs Agencies of the United States Government to reinvent themselves in order to gain greater effectiveness and efficiency in dealing with both diplomatic traditional areas and the growth and demands of the non-traditional issues of the preservation of oceans, the environment, transnational criminal activity to include drugs, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the inequitable distribution of basic needs for clean water, food and energy

This necessitates a culture change in terms of career progression that values training and outside assignment. In essence, "jointness", a concept that denotes cooperation and understanding between affiliated organizations, becomes a necessary step to promotion. Career milestones in the form of training and education at entry, mid-level and senior level career points set the path. There must be professional career development. The goal is a cultural change. The change however must be accomplished with the outside pressure of Legislation from Congress. In order for implementation to be more than lip service it must be law.

The cultural change produced by the recommendations made in this paper will achieve a sense of "jointness" among the Foreign Affairs Agencies. It will produce better policy making, improve communication with Congress and the American people, and generate informed and trained diplomatic practitioners of public policy in a time of complex challenges and threats. Most importantly it will inculcate a system of better managers of people and programs utilizing resources effectively and efficiently engendering a new respect and trust for the men and women of the Foreign Affairs Agencies. In the final analysis, dedicated, mission oriented human beings are both the engine of change and the makers of policy in the affairs of nations specifically and humanity in general!

Word Count=5,622

ENDNOTES

¹ William Z. Slaney, "A History of the U.S. Foreign Service 1924-1999." State Magazine (May 1999): 22-23.

² Louise C. Eaton, "75th Anniversary Activities Planned." State Magazine (May 1999): 24-27.

³ U.S. Department of State Strategic Plan for International Affairs (September 1997): 59.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid., 14.

⁶ State 2000, "A New Model for Managing Foreign Affairs." Report of the U.S. Department of State Management Task Force (December 1992): 63.

⁷ AFSANET "Workforce Planning" State Standing Committee Update: October 21 (October 1999).

⁸ Eaton.

⁹ U.S. Department of State: 59.

¹⁰ Marshall Adair, "President's Views, Challenges for a New Board." Foreign Service Journal (October 1999): 5.

¹¹ State 2000, Appendix.

¹² U.S. Department of State, 9.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Reorganization Plan and Report Submitted Pursuant to Section 1601 of the Foreign Affairs' Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998, as contained in Public Law 105-277: 1.

¹⁵ Ibid., 89.

¹⁶ Ibid., 90.

¹⁷ Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr. "Unification of the United States Armed Forces: Implementing the 1986 Department of Defense Reorganization Act." Strategic Studies Institute (August 1996): 2.

¹⁸ Ibid., 32.

¹⁹ Slaney, 10.

²⁰ Slaney, 10.

²¹ David T. Jones, "You Call this a Career?" Foreign Service Journal (December 1999): 39.

²² Henry L. Stinson, "Getting Our Government House in Order: Remodeling the Foreign Affairs Machinery." Equipped for the Future, Managing U.S. Foreign Affairs in the 21st Century. Washington, D.C.: The Henry L. Stinson Center, 1998 (E885, E68-1998): 13.

²³ AFSANET: Report of the State Overseas Preserve Advisory Panel. 24 November 1999: 1.

²⁴ Jones, 40.

²⁵ Stinson, 13.

²⁶ AFSANET: Report of the State Overseas Preserve Advisory Panel, 2.

²⁷ AFSANET: The Public Dimension of Foreign Policy in the 21st Century. 13 January 2000: 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adair, Marshall. "President's Views, Challenges for a New Board." Foreign Service Journal (October 1999): 5.

AFSANET – Early Promotion Consideration: (03-14-00)

AFSANET – Legislative Update: (12-20-99). Overview: Part I

AFSANET – Legislative Update: (12-27-99). Overview: Part II

AFSANET – Report of the State Overseas Presence Advisory Panel: 24 November 1999.

AFSANET – State Standing Committee Update: October 21 (Oct 1999) "Workforce Planning".

AFSANET – The Public Dimension of Foreign Policy in the 21st Century: 13 January 2000.

Department of State Personnel Policies: An ICASS Perspective, November 17, 1998. Michael McLaughlin (Director)

Eaton, Louise C. "75th Anniversary Activities Planned." State Magazine (May 1999): 24-27.

Guldin, Bob. "Mr. X Goes To Washington: An Interview with George Kennan." Foreign Service Journal (May 1999): 32-38.

Henry L. Stinson Center, "Getting Our Government House in Order: Remodeling the Foreign Affairs Machinery." In Equipped for the Future, Managing U.S. Foreign Affairs in the 21st Century. Washington, D.C.: The Henry L. Stinson Center, 1998 (E885, E68 1998) 11-14.

Henry, David. "The Foreign Service: Through Ambassador Pickering's Eyes." State Magazine (May 1999): 28-31.

Jones, David T. "You Call This a Career?" Foreign Service Journal (December 1999): 22-28.

Lovelace, Douglas C., Jr. Unification of the United States Armed Forces: Implementing the 1986 Department of Defense Reorganization Act. Strategic Studies Institute (August 1996)

Lovell, John P. Recruitment and Promotion of Foreign Service Personnel in the Challenge of American Foreign Policy: Purpose and Adaptation. New York: McMillan, 1985, 192-203 (JX1706, L681985)

Medlock, Kathleen Van Tre. A Critical Analysis of the Impact of the Department of Defense Reorganization Act on American Officership. (V.M.I. Dissertation Services) U.S. Army Military History Institute (VB 413. M44 1993a)

Renick, Tim. The Goldwater-Nichols Act Ten Years Later. Ft. McNair, Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Library (1996) (U411; 292 G65 1996)

Reorganization Plan and Report: Submitted Pursuant to Section 1601 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998, as contained in Public Law 105-277.

Slaney, William Z. "A History of the U.S. Foreign Service 1924-1999." State Magazine (May 1999): 22-23.

State 2000: A New Model for Managing Foreign Affairs. Report of the U.S. Department of State Management Task Force. (December 1992): 63.

State Department: Professional Development of Foreign Service Employees. United States General Accounting Office Report to the Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate. (JX M06, 75 0531989) (AWC Library)

Steele, Martin R. Lt Gen, USMC 1998 Current Strategy Forum "Beyond National Security: Forging Deep Coalitions of National Capabilities for the 21st Century." p.10

U.S. Department of State Strategic Plan: September 1997 for International Affairs.

United States Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.

Yuknis, Christopher Allan. The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986: An Internal Assessment. (UA 233.Y8) 1992 (USAWC Military Studies Program Paper)